IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

XPERTUNIVERSE, INC.,)
Plaintiff)
v.)) Civil Action No. 09-157 (RGA)
CISCO SYSTEMS, INC.,)
Defendant.)

JURY VERDICT FORM

You, the jury, are to answer the following questions based on the evidence admitted at trial and according to all of the instructions I have given you.

A. FRAUDULENT CONCEALMENT

1. Did XpertUniverse prove, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Cisco committed fraud by concealment?

Answer "Yes" or "No":	
If you answered "Yes" to	Ouestion 1 then answer Question 2.

2. What damages do you find XpertUniverse has proven by a preponderance of the evidence it should recover for its loss that was caused by Cisco's fraud by concealment?

Answer:	\$				
---------	----	--	--	--	--

B. INFRINGEMENT OF XPERTUNIVERSE'S PATENTS

1. Did XpertUniverse prove, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Cisco infringed Claim 5 of U.S. Patent No. 7,366,709?

Expert Advisor:	Answer	"Yes"	or	"No"	•
Pulse: Answer '	"Yes" or	"No" :			

2. Did XpertUniverse prove, by a preponderance of the evidence, that
Cisco infringed claim 12 of U.S. Patent No. 7,499,903? (Please answer Yes or No
for each accused product)
Expert Advisor: Answer "Yes" or "No" :
Remote Expert: Answer "Yes" or "No" :
C. <u>VALIDITY OF XPERTUNIVERSE'S PATENTS</u>
1. Did Cisco prove, by clear and convincing evidence, that claim 5 of
U.S. Patent No. 7,366,709 is invalid due to anticipation?
Answer "Yes" or "No":
2. Did Cisco prove, by clear and convincing evidence, that claim 5 of
U.S. Patent No. 7,366,709 is invalid due to obviousness?
Answer "Yes" or "No":
3. Did Cisco prove, by clear and convincing evidence, that claim 12 of
U.S. Patent No. 7,499,903 is invalid due to anticipation?
Answer "Yes" or "No":
4. Did Cisco prove, by clear and convincing evidence, that claim 12 of
U.S. Patent No. 7,499,903 is invalid due to obviousness?
Answer "Yes" or "No":

D. DAMAGES FOR CISCO'S PATENT INFRINGEMENT

Answer the question posed in this Section only if you (i) found, in Section B that XpertUniverse proved that Cisco infringed U.S. Patent No. 7,366,709 or 7,499,903, and (ii) found that Cisco did not prove that a claim for which you answered "Yes" in Section B was invalid.

1. What damages do you find XpertUniverse has proven by a preponderance of the evidence it should recover for Cisco's infringement of XpertUniverse's patents?

Products	Amount			
Expert Advisor	\$			
Pulse	\$			
Remote Expert	\$			
	Signed this day of March, 2013			
	JURY FOREPERSON			

JUROR
JUROR
JUROR